

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pieper (US 2004/0205690 A1).

Claims 1-4, 8 and 9 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice, claims are amended, and thus, pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter is added.

Claim 5 is amended requiring the limitations of claim 4.

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 6, citing "hierarchical" in paragraph [0030] and "authorizations" in Fig. 9 and paragraph [0078]. However, Pieper paragraph 30 discusses hierarchical nature of meta data, and paragraph 78 and FIG. 9 refer to an application generated based upon meta data and an application process, namely a display screen that has the name "authorizations," rather than the claimed "flow definition information which defines a predetermined number of hierarchical levels, on each of which an approver gives approval to a form, in a work flow of a form process." In other words, Pieper fails to disclose expressly or inherently the language of claims requiring hierarchical level approvals of forms in a work flow of form process. Pieper's FIG. 9 appears to relate to processes an operator is authorized to perform at an organization, such as "new private customer." However, a prima facie case of anticipation over Pieper cannot be established, because Pieper does not disclose expressly or inherently the claimed "reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a predetermined number of hierarchical levels, on each of which an approver gives approval to a form, in a work flow of a form process" in claim 4. See FIG. 37, work flow table 1004 and the first-fourth approvers. Further, Pieper fails to disclose expressly or inherently the claimed "reading, from the storing device, screen definition information which defines screen items of a screen used in the work flow of the form process, generates; and generating a screen program for displaying a listing screen of forms, which wait for approval given by the approvers, by using the read screen definition information, wherein the listing screen of forms, which wait for approval by the approvers, are generated in response to respective approvals by the approvers." See FIG. 37, approval forms 1201-1204. For example, FIG. 37 and page 32 line 15 through page 33 line 22 of the Specification support the claim amendments.

The Office Action also rejects claim 6 by citing Pieper's "frame" and "screen" in paragraph [0088]. However, the Office Action rejection rationale is ambiguous. Pieper paragraph 88 relates to entering of "new private customer" information, so paragraph 88 does not relate to "withdrawing a form." Nevertheless, it is readily apparent that Pieper fails to expressly or inherently disclose the claimed "reading, from a storing device, flow definition information which defines a status of presence of withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process ~~or withdrawal of a form forwarded in a work flow of a form process~~; and generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes a button for withdrawing a form, if the read flow definition information indicates the status of presence of withdrawal, ~~and generating a screen program for displaying a screen, which includes a button for withdrawing a form, if the flow definition information indicates the status of absence of withdrawal.~~" For example, FIG. 36 and page 32, lines 1-14 support the claim amendments.

Allowance of the claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: June 25, 2008 By: _____
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501